

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 7, 2007. Claims 1 to 3, 8 to 13, and 25 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 8 to 13, and 25 are independent. Claims 1, 8 to 13, and 25 have been amended herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and is submitted to have been obviated by the amendments made to Claim 1.

Claims 1, 3, 8 to 13, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Publication No. 2005/0166257 (Feinleib) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,017,173 (Armstrong). Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Feinleib in view of Armstrong and further in view of WO 00/01154 (Rajan). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, searching means for searching for a corresponding commercial content from said database based on said information specifying said sponsor of said first program requested from said content management server and information determining the combination of said sponsor of said first program and the commercial content of said second program, and notifying the commercial content to said content management server.

Claims 8 to 10 recite, *inter alia*, said commercial content is determined based on said information specifying said sponsor of said first program and information

determining a combination of said sponsor of said first program and the commercial content of said second program.

Claims 11 to 13 recite, *inter alia*, second reception means for (Claim 11) or a second reception step of (Claims 12 and 13), based on the information specifying the sponsor of the first program received by said first reception means (Claim 11) or at said first reception step (Claims 12 and 13) and information determining a combination of said sponsor of the first program and a commercial content of the second program, requesting transfer of commercial content from a predetermined commercial server provided on the Internet, and receiving the commercial content.

Claim 25 recites, *inter alia*, display control means for displaying a commercial content of the second program determined based on information specifying a sponsor of the first program and information designating a combination of the sponsor of the first program and a commercial content of the second program.

Applicant respectfully submits that none of Feinlab, Armstrong, and Rajan, either alone or in combination, assuming, *arguendo*, that such could be combined, is seen to disclose or suggest at least the above-discussed features.

With respect to Feinlab, the Office Action concedes that this document does not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features.

With respect to Armstrong, this document is merely seen to describe a method and apparatus for inserting advertisement and/or other information into an

audio-video presentation during the presentation of non-active imagery. As described in Armstrong, advertisement content (or other secondary content) is provided to a subscriber in response to a stop or pause command. Both demographic information and content-related information are used to determine which advertising content will be provided. The content-related information is based upon the scene or segment in which the subscriber invoked the stop or pause command. The demographic information is based upon a demographic profile with which the user is associated. See column 5, lines 6 to 60 of Armstrong.

Armstrong is believed to be silent concerning a sponsor of a first program and its relation to commercial content of a second program. Thus, nowhere is Armstrong seen to disclose or suggest information determining the combination of the sponsor of the first program and the commercial content of the second program, as recited by the instant claims.


Rajan is not seen to remedy the foregoing deficiencies of Feinlab and Armstrong.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from an independent claim discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,


Darnond E. Vadnais
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 52,310

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 130284v1